

Appendix

Cuba
Address by Senator Morton to Georgia Press Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent and pointed address delivered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] to the Georgia Press Institute, at Athens, Ga., on February 21, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORTON TO GEORGIA PRESS INSTITUTE, CONVENED IN ATHENS, GA., FEBRUARY 21, 1963

Your profession and mine have a problem in common these days. We are becoming obsolete. News and legislation are being fully automated. There is a giant new machine that grinds out both commodities; grinds them out, serves them up, ties a bib around your neck, spoon feeds you, and even sends a doctor around to examine you if the diet happens to disagree with you.

The newspaperman is expected to pass the package along to his readers. The legislator is expected to pass the package along to his constituents. The linotype machine and the legislative machine, in this grand design, can both be replaced by rubberstamps.

The machine is the executive branch of the Government. And your old friend Arthur Sylvester, who used to be a newspaperman himself, is one of its chief operators. I'm sure you remember the development of his blueprint. It started in October, when a number of conscientious newspapermen suddenly realized that news of the Cuban crisis was being controlled by a system of censorship tighter even than that of the Second World War. At least during that war newsmen often were taken into the Government's confidence.

Arthur Sylvester had a different view. Remember his classic explanation? "News generated by actions of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has in the application of military force and related forces to the solution of political problems, or to the application of international political pressure. In the kind of world we live in the generation of news by actions taken by the Government becomes one weapon in a strained situation. The results, in my opinion justify the methods we used."

Two months later Sylvester was still sticking to his weapons of news management. This time he made a public statement that should be tacked up in every news room—either as a grim reminder or as a replacement for the usual creed of the journalist. He said that "it would seem to me basic, all through history, that it's an inherent government right, if necessary, to lie to save itself . . ."

On another occasion Sylvester elaborated this truth-strangling policy to the Air Force

Association in Nevada. He said that Air Force public relations officers must manage news to keep it in harmony with the actions of the President and his top advisers.

Now I don't question for a moment the right of a government to protect vital military security secrets. We have plenty of laws to cover that and we also have the conscience of your profession. In the Second World War, for instance, many reporters were entrusted with military secrets and they kept them. But a deliberate policy of lying is something else again.

It is also something else again when Government policy, as it did at both the State Department and the Defense Department during the Cuban crisis—and as it still does at Defense—requires officials to check in with the boss every time a reporter drops around.

Arthur Krock, the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times and the respected dean of the Washington press corps, recently had this comment on muzzling by memo:

"There is a basic functional conflict involved. The responsible press is trained to recognize, and will not publish, news inimical to national security. The press knows that international crises do and must enlarge this category. But if and when a government has shown a tendency to inflate the category, and also virtually polices the contacts of officials with news reporters, both press and public are denied the legitimate information which, as the President himself acknowledged . . . 'any administration must depend on as a check on its own actions.'"

That's a fine statement and, as Mr. Krock meant it, its quotation of the President is ironic. I can't recall any administration in our history that has seemed less interested in checks on its own actions than this one.

In LOOK magazine last August another famous newsmen, Fletcher Knebel, compiled this bill of particulars. It's an overflowing menu of kingly Kennedy reactions to reporters trying to do their jobs.

Hear the charges:

"Kennedy personally has called down at least six Washington correspondents either for their writings or for their publications."

"Three Kennedy administration officials have threatened to sue newspapers."

"Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has reproved at least four newspapermen for stories he disliked."

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation questioned six newspapermen in connection with stories concerning policies of the Kennedy administration."

"Pentagon security officials quizzed three correspondents."

"The White House canceled 22 subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune."

"Administration officials, reporters charge, put the freeze on some reporters who had offended them."

"White House Special Counsel Theodore C. Sorenson has reprimanded some newspapermen."

"White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger has rebuked about a dozen reporters for their stories."

"White House Aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a Pulitzer Prize historian, called one columnist an idiot."

"Even the Kennedy women have gotten into the act. Ethel Kennedy, wife of the Attorney General, and Mrs. Jean Smith,

sister of the President, braced one correspondent for his story about dunkings in the Bob Kennedy swimming pool."

"What amazes many in the huge Washington newspaper fraternity in the Kennedy era is not the fact of White House disenchantment, but the volume, extent, and dexterity of its expression. Never before have so few bawled out so many so often for so little. Says Merriman Smith, of United Press International, the senior White House correspondent, 'Every administration develops Potomac sunburn sooner or later. The main difference with the Kennedy people is that their hypersensitivity developed so early. One reason is the close attention they pay to everything written about them. How they can spot an obscure paragraph in a paper of 3,000 circulation 2,000 miles away is beyond me. They must have a thousand little gnomes reading the papers for them.'"

Its attitude toward the press is just one example, but it covers virtually the whole scale of executive excess. It descends to the pettiness of canceling subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune when that paper's needle got too sharp. It includes the barrage of pressures we keep hearing about against newspapers in Florida which insist on printing news of the Cuba buildup in the face of White House denials of such a buildup.

It included the ridiculous but actually ominous request some months ago for voluntary self-censorship of the American press, a censorship that was couched in terms so vague that even the comic strips and the advice to the lovelorn columns could be included according to the sensitivity of a bureaucrat's feelings.

And it included what, to me, remains one of the most appalling misuses of government power on record—the incident in which the FBI was sent to rout reporters from their beds in the small hours of the morning to check the sources of their stories on Kennedy's steel crisis.

There is some drama and considerable danger in all of those incidents. There is another example of executive news management, that is far more subtle and every bit as disturbing. It involves the manipulation of facts and figures—the sort of offense for which bookkeepers can go to jail but for which bureaucrats don't seem called upon to pay at all.

As some of us recall rather vividly, there was an election last year. One of the hot issues involved was that of employment, or lack of it. Many a candidate was running on the administration's record in that area. In October, with all the precision of a military maneuver, the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, released his regular report on employment.

In an election period it was a blockbuster. It said that "over 4,500,000 more Americans have jobs than when this administration took office in January 1961." It said that unemployment was, and again I quote, "over 2 million less than in January of 1961."

No one can accurately count just how many votes those statements were worth. If they were true they were worth votes. They deserved it. If they were true.

Now you saw those figures. A lot of you undoubtedly used them. A lot of legislators used them in considering their positions as well as in appealing for votes. After all, they were Government figures. And we've come to accept Government figures as something just about sacred.

And so we went into the election and you went into your newspapers with that inspiring batch of statistics. After the voting was over, Secretary Wirtz had a little confession to make. It turns out that he hadn't really checked those figures quite as closely as he should have. Just an error, he said. No political motivation. So sorry.

Let's look at the slight errors. Remember that the official certified pasteurized, cauterized, sanitized Government figures showed 4½ million more Americans at work than when the administration took over.

Well, the actual figure turned out to be 1,224,000 almost exactly the sort of labor force increase we have been experiencing right along through normal growth in our population and markets. The little error was a little error of more than 200 percent—that's all.

What about the other figure, of 2 million less unemployed. That was a slight error too. The correct figure, the figure we got on second thought, after the elections were over, turned out to be 784,000—again, nothing startling. Of course, we have to admit that the second figure was pretty near perfect on a relative scale of New Frontier mathematics. It was slightly less than 100 percent wrong.

In Kennedyland, as in Disneyland, a 100 percent slip from reality is scarcely anything to get excited about. We should expect it.

That was an example of rewriting the present. What about rewriting history? That, too, is a function of the well-oiled machine that is attempting to operate a government by handout.

In one case it also involved a clear exposition of the theory that there is one set of rules for the ordinary people and another set altogether for the Kennedys.

You will recall that another of the big stories you weren't permitted to cover was the action in the Bay of Pigs. Four high-ranking officials of the Government were assigned the job of investigating the reasons for its failure. They were pledged to secrecy. Last month one of them broke that pledge. But it was all right, his name was Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy. In the face of an accumulation of evidence that would have impressed a mere mortal, he blandly said that the invasion simply hadn't been promised any air cover. His real thrust, of course, was that story after story pinning the responsibility for withdrawal of air support on Brother Jack's shoulders were all wrong. Kennedys can do no wrong. The invasion fiasco was all the fault of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA.

The main point here, however, is that Bobby broke the secrecy pledge. His brother backed him up, of course. But the others involved in the investigation are still wearing their muzzles.

When you can control the truth as tightly as that, who can say that the muzzle doesn't fit almost everyone in one way or another? A group of editors who recalled the President mentioning air cover in a private interview have been blandly told that their memories are faulty. No such mention was made. Where can you find truth in a situation like that?

What about the famous Saturday Evening Post article on the Cuban affair. Most of us probably remember it chiefly for its none-too-subtle stabbing of Adlai Stevenson. Personally, I think that was just a secondary matter. The real significance is in who wrote the story and what it was based upon. The authors were Stew Alsop and Charlie Bartlett, the latter being a close friend of the President and the man who introduced him to Jackie. The main burden of the story portrayed the President and his advisers as a magnificent team, operating flawlessly to face down the foe. It included

access to information of such a high order of secrecy that other reporters might have reasonably expected a flying call from the FBI. Certainly it involved more sensitive areas than those that brought the FBI to reporters during the Kennedy steel crisis. But not in this case. Kennedys, you must remember, can do no wrong nor, apparently can their friends.

Much of this whole question, it seems to me, involves this kingly concept of right, of always being right, of always appearing right. It's no longer all the news that's fit to print—now it's all the news that fits the Kennedy image.

Part of that image, so far as Bobby is concerned, has been bent under the eight-wheel weight of the Teamster's Union. Brother Jack once said that any competent Attorney General could clap Jimmy Hoffa in jail. But then he appointed Bobby.

This year, in Nashville Bobby was still trying to get the job done. You know what happened. The Nashville Banner obtained a report that an attempt had been made to tamper the jury. The Banner didn't have any more reason than Bobby for wanting to see Hoffa get off the hook. But its journalistic mission and even reputation were directly challenged. Bobby directly applied pressure to keep the Banner from printing its story. The Banner refused.

The point was the same. It was the Kennedy image that was at stake and the facts had to fit.

I said at the outset that our problem was one in common. We both have our troubles in this era of executive excess.

You recall the story of the psychiatrist who admitted a beautiful blond patient into his inner sanctum. After an amorous interlude, he said, "that takes care of my problem—now what's yours?"

Well, I certainly haven't taken care of your problem, but I'd like to touch on mine. Actually it's still your problem because it is a problem in the whole structure of representative government.

Again, executive excess sums it up. The same sort of executive excess that permits bureaucrats to presume to tell you what to print, when to print it, and even how to interpret it.

Until right now there has been pretty general agreement that the success of our form of government rests on the balance of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

But things have changed. We have some fellows in Washington who equate checks and balances with brakes—brakes on their vehicle of executive pride and power.

James McGregor Burns, a biographer of both Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, has just recently called the Congress a stumbling block to democracy.

The President himself insisted that the rules of the House of Representatives had to be changed so as to not interfere with his programs, his powers, his desires.

The Budget Director has told the Congress that its Members can't consider the budget properly because they "fragment" it by dividing it into receipts and expenditures. Only the President, he says, can view the budget properly.

What's that leave for the Congress or the Senate? If the budget is opposed, or trimmed, the Congress and the Senate stand accused of obstructionism. Actually, of course, they should stand complimented for representing their own constituencies and their own consciences.

The administration's education bill is now before us. It's an omnibus bill, a fully packed grab bag of administration plans. Some of its items may be fine, others may not. Senators and Congressmen are supposed to exercise some judgment in these matters. But not in this case. The admin-

istration prefers that the bill be considered as a total piece of legislation. Take it or leave it. The Executive has spoken.

When Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court with men who would bend to his executive will there was an outcry that rocked the country. There should be a similar outcry now against the attempts to pack the executive with so much excessive power that all the other branches of Government are subordinated.

When the Congress refused to pass a bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs, the President tried his best to override their wishes by establishing a department by Executive order. His first attempt didn't work but the pressure is still on, experts are still collecting in the executive offices. Most importantly, it showed a trend or tendency—a trend or tendency away from legislative government and toward executive government.

Rooted in the urban affairs proposal also was another extension of Executive excess—the notion that the great cities of America should be cut away from their State moorings and hauled into the Federal harbor.

Perhaps we could be excused for shrugging off these Executive excesses. One by one they seem relatively innocent. Together they are far from it. And nowhere is this more alarmingly apparent than in the life-or-death matters of our national security.

Key members of congressional committees recently awoke to read newspaper stories describing our negotiations to remove missile bases from Turkey and Italy; negotiations based upon Executive decisions. Just a few weeks earlier Khrushchev's demands that we remove those missiles in return for his removal of missiles from Cuba had been hooted down as another Munich. But suddenly, without consultation and without the opportunity to obtain congressional expressions, the Munich was underway, prettied up with a new set of clothes supposed to represent modernization of our weapons systems. Even if Polaris is considered sufficient, extra insurance in Italy and Turkey won't hurt.

The Nassau agreement with Prime Minister Macmillan was another example of negotiation in sunny secrecy, of decisions which affect us all but which were arrived at quickly, perhaps precipitously by the Executive alone. Perhaps Congress should feel no pain at being left out of that one, however. The President's own Secretary of State, or at least the man who carries the title, wasn't even present. Maybe that was a simple division of labor. The President took on the job of imperiling Mr. Macmillan's government and the Secretary of State was held in reserve to do the same sort of job on Canada's Prime Minister.

When, if ever a disarmament agreement finally is reached, one wonders what razzle-dazzle of public relations will be used to break the news to the American people and their representatives in Congress. What are the guidelines for disarmament? I hope they are clearer, more solid, and more definitive than the shifting sands of the Executive's statements and press releases on the subject.

But where, instead, are the policymaking position papers on disarmament being written? Many of them are coming from the special, private research corporations which, through contracts with the executive branch, are springing up like mushrooms, or toadstools, in Washington today.

The excuse for these groups is simple. Government can't pay the salaries needed to get top rate men, it's said. So the private corporations are founded, with massive Government contracts, to provide the thinkers who wouldn't work for ordinary wages. These policy technicians have become virtually a counterpart government, responsible to no constituency but fully integrated into the Executive's excessive power structure.

1963

This shadow government is just another way around Congress, another way toward an all-powerful Presidency no longer harnessed to Government institutions responsible for their decisions but free to use the whole Nation as the guinea pig for special theories and special interests.

Other Presidents have had their kitchen cabinets, even their shadow cabinets. This one is the first to have a shadow government.

Of course, there are excuses aplenty for this Executive excess. One is that our society has become so complex it can no longer rely on the cumbersome machinery of representative government to get its job done. There seems to be some magic mathematical limit on individual responsibility.

Planning is another magical excuse word. Our society is said to be so interdependent that it can't rely on individual responsibility to accomplish the integrated planning needed to get us moving.

I think those excuses are nonsense. The root of the growing tree of Executive power is simply distrust of the people.

The New Frontier is simply a frontier of fear—fear that people can no longer manage their own lives, fear that they might take some course other than that plotted and planned in the all-wise, all-knowing ivory tower.

Taxes are described in this new philosophy as not merely a means to raise revenues but as a way to distribute income. The free market doesn't do a good enough job. People spend their money on the wrong things. The solution? Simple, let the Government take the money and spend it for you.

It's really ironic. In this period of our history, since the turn of the century anyway, our average incomes have doubled and doubled again. Our individual education has grown from a grade school average to a high school average and is now approaching a full college average.

Nevertheless, we find that the prevailing theory is that we are not smart enough to handle our own affairs. We must be protected from ourselves.

We can't insure ourselves against sickness or old age. The Government must do it and do it all, without options, given its way.

We can't build our own schools in our own communities. The Federal Government must do it for us.

We can't settle our own affairs in business and industry, the Federal Government must alone be wise enough.

We can't raise prices, we can't lower prices, we can't work short hours, we can't work long hours. We can't be trusted even to take someone to lunch for a business chat.

That's the nub of it. Mistrust of the people.

One of the administration's economic oracles spelled it out in a book when he wrote that "the marginal tax dollar has currently a much higher social utility than the marginal pay-envelope dollar. The former goes to schools; the latter into tall fins." The author was Alvin Hansen, professor emeritus of political economy at Harvard.

Simple, isn't it? Government is wise. Individuals are foolish.

Nobody denies that some people do act foolishly. Even people in government act foolishly. Even Senators do—although rarely.

But today we see public policy based upon the sweeping assumption that most people would behave foolishly if left to their own devices and not herded by government.

The picture is alarming. Parents would stop sending their children to school and then they'd stop building schools. Everybody over 50 would be ground down under the poverty induced by a misspent youth. Our cities would lie in rubble because the residents wouldn't have enough sense or money to keep them up. The countryside

would be a tangle of weeds because there would be no one to tell the farmers what to grow. Detroit would be making cars 50 feet long, costing \$50,000 which would be sold in great numbers to the 6 or 7 bloated millionaires who had made billions by merging railroads and forcing everyone to buy high cost steel. Why there might even be some extremists in our midst who would hold meetings to criticize the Soviet Union.

Far fetched? It may sound so, but it is precisely this sort of mistrust of the individual that lies behind every attempt to usurp the power of the people in order to protect the people.

I prefer, and I think most Americans either do or will, when given a clear choice, prefer the sort of government envisioned by the late Supreme Court Justice Jackson when he said, "It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizens from falling into error; it is the function of the citizens to keep the Government from falling into error."

Fortunately, we can still do this. The Congress may be unpopular in some quarters, but it is still there. And you still elect it. You, in particular, are involved, because you still cover those elections and can accord to them the importance they deserve.

This is not a partisan matter. My good friend, the late great Democratic Senator Robert Kerr was alert to it when he said that he honored the President but he honored the wishes of the people of Oklahoma more.

He was sensitive to it also when he obtained a virtually unprecedented unanimous vote from his colleagues to try to prevent the President from administering the public works funds as a tool of political pressure.

Our challenge today is to the structure of our government, its entire system of checks and balances, not just to one party or another. The Presidency is fast becoming a party unto itself, aloof, alone, lordly, and disdainful of the individual. Rule by machine has been a disgrace in some of our major cities. But rule by machine is becoming a crisis in our capital. The population explosion may be a peril elsewhere in the world but it is the power explosion in Washington that is the peril here.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the great goal of our liberty. We must not now, on pretexts of efficiency or new problems and new answers abandon that goal and substitute in its place government of the Executive, by the Executive and for the Executive—or, to put it bluntly, government of the Kennedys, by the Kennedys, and for the Kennedys.

In the face of President Kennedy's proposal of a \$13.5 billion top-off of citizen liability to the Federal Treasury, the California seat vacated by the death of Representative Clem Miller, Democrat, was won by Don CLAUSEN, Republican.

The vote was 79,340 for CLAUSEN to 65,817 for William F. Grader, his Democratic opponent.

Easily the issue most emphasized in the election was President Kennedy's message asking \$98.8 billion for the next fiscal year, as against an estimated \$11.9 billion current deficit and request for a tax cut of \$13.5 billion spread over 3 years.

Quite evidently, that financial proposal did not go well with the 365,281 population of the California First District, hugging the Pacific Coast from San Francisco to the Oregon border.

Federal tax cuts within memory, 1948 and 1954, also did no good at the polls.

The 80th Congress (the first controlled by the Republicans since the 1920's) set out to cut taxes.

In 1948, with presidential nominating conventions close at hand, both Houses passed a \$5 billion tax reduction and overrode Truman's veto.

Even so, the Nation's voters reelected President Truman and returned Democratic majorities to both Houses of Congress.

When the Republicans returned to power in 1953, President Eisenhower and Congress passed tax packages revising downward excises on personal apparel and home appliances and reducing income tax rates.

Election of Representative CLAUSEN raises to four the Republican gain in the House of Representatives and raises the Republican membership from California to 14, against 24 Democrats.

Employment of Mature Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this article, written by Mr. Elmer L. Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., demonstrates how the author's organization is making efforts to help our senior citizens lead useful and productive lives according to their capabilities. It seems to me that it demonstrates several attitudes and procedures that the Federal Government and private industry should consider relative to employment of senior citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Employment of Mature Women" from the October 1962 issue of Retirement Life describing the special capabilities a mature woman brings to her job.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT OF MATURE WOMEN

(By Elmer L. Winter, president, Manpower, Inc.)

Today's mature woman should treat age as an asset when seeking employment.

Despite some overhanging prejudices which remain to be dispelled, women past 50—and even well into the sixties—can

GOP Wins Election Despite Tax Bait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, of February 10, 1963:

GOP WINS ELECTION DESPITE TAX BAIT

WASHINGTON.—Just as under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, a congressional by election in California proved that tax reduction is not necessarily potent in bidding for popular votes.

find jobs, if they know where and how to look.

During my years as president of the world's largest temporary help and business service firm, I have become aware of the needs of mature workers and of their desire to work. The age barrier is rapidly crumbling, but the older would-be employees should realize that some unfounded criticisms still exist.

Chief objections heard are: poor performance; difficulties in training and adjustment; inability to get along with fellow workers; absenteeism, and undependability.

Information gathered by Manpower, Inc., and the National Association of Manufacturers shows there is no validity to these objections, but awareness of them can aid the mature job hunter in two ways: her self-confidence will increase; and she can assist in dislodging the myths about older workers.

A survey of 3,100 companies, conducted by the NAM, disclosed that the mature worker takes special pride in performing well, that she trains with concentration and adjusts well, that she is less likely than her younger coworkers to become involved in office bickering, that she is absent no more (and often less because of a more stable life), and that her dependability ranks high when compared with that of other employees.

In my book, "A Woman's Guide to Earning a Good Living," I offer these suggestions to the mature worker contemplating a position: Never feel embarrassed about your age. It can be turned into a distinct asset for you.

Be careful of your appearance. Neat, simple clothes, a figure under control, a firm handshake, good posture, and a quiet manner will count in your favor more than the mere statistic of your birth will count against you.

Be especially careful when filling in your application. Accuracy, neatness, and full information will make a good impression.

Using these basic suggestions as your guide to approaching a prospective employer, try these questions to determine your availability. Ask yourself:

"Will I be physically able to hold down the job I want?" (A physical examination within the past 6 months is a must.)

"Have I had (or do I need) training or retraining?"

"Have I decided why I want to work?"

"Have I investigated thoroughly (if I'm over 65) how a job will affect my social security payments?"

When assessing your background, consider the volunteer work you have done. Through work in church and civic groups, the PTA, scout leadership, or the myriad of other volunteer jobs available, you probably have developed skills and experience an employer wants. Thousands of older women have been placed in positions on the basis of their volunteer accomplishments.

If you have not worked for a period of time, or wish to try something new, it's a good idea to consult an expert in vocational guidance—generally available at vocational or high schools, in State employment offices or in private professional offices. These experts, at little or no cost, will test you to ascertain your fitness for the work you want and you then can determine whether and how much training you need. You might also consult your local Manpower, Inc., office about the possibilities open to you in the temporary help field, since part-time or periodic employment are often especially suited to the mature worker.

Refresher courses are good—both for technical and psychological reasons. A poor impression is made if you act unsure of your skill as a typist, for example, and it is excellent salesmanship to know the answer when asked, "How many words per minute?"

Courses, covering a variety of areas, are available in most sizable communities. Check with your local schools, colleges, Y's, and business institutes. You will find the

type of training you want at a reasonable price. And don't be concerned about your age; you'll find many in the same age bracket when you get to class.

At this point you should ask yourself, "Why do I want to work?" Are you eager and interested in obtaining gainful employment? Do you feel that you have something to contribute, something to give of yourself?

Most mature women, whose family and other responsibilities are diminished, answer these questions with a resounding "Yes." Thanks to advances in health, improvement in household aids, and perhaps foremost, an altered mental attitude toward age, women in their fifties and sixties are rarin' to go. If you feel you have this mental outlook and are interested in playing a more active role, you've answered the "why" of working and should prove an asset to whatever firm you join.

The next step is to determine exactly what job you want. The Women's Division of the U.S. Department of Labor reports the best areas for mature women to seek employment are: offices, hotels, schools and institutions, the apparel market, restaurants, hospitals, beauty salons and retail stores.

Since you've earlier assessed your basic skills, look to these fields for the specific position which best suits you. Remember, the ability to choose a job which can best utilize your talents is important—to you as well as to your employer.

Briefly, we should consider how working will affect any social security benefits you are receiving or expect to receive shortly. Consult your local Social Security office. Here you will learn how much you can earn, when and how it will affect your benefits. You will also receive assistance in planning work which will still allow you to collect what's coming to you.

Decide now where you should seek employment by:

Checking your local newspaper help wanted ads.

Consulting your local Manpower, Inc., office.

Applying to local employment agencies, the State employment service, the Young Women's Christian Association, Knights of Columbus, or similar organizations.

Writing letters of application and making personal visits to possible employers.

The principal guide for the older worker, I believe, should always be to: turn maturity into an asset; feel certain of what you can do and train to do it as well as you can; make certain that the job you accept fit one where you will, in every sense, fit into the picture.

If you can keep these guides in mind when job hunting, you're ready to go to work regardless of the year of your birth.

A Challenge to New England Outdoor Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Executive Director Thomas L. Kimball, of the National Wildlife Federation at the Silver Anniversary Sportsmen's Show Dinner of the New England Outdoor Writers Association on January 19, 1963, at the Hotel Kenmore, Boston, Mass.

The article is entitled "A Challenge to New England Outdoor Writers," but it might more correctly be denominated "Pollution: Blight to Our Nation and Shame to the Inadequate Efforts of the Public Health Service".

A CHALLENGE TO NEW ENGLAND OUTDOOR WRITERS

(NOTE.—Address by Executive Director Thomas L. Kimball at the silver anniversary Sportsmen's Show dinner of the New England Outdoor Writers Association, 7 p.m., January 19, 1963, Hotel Kenmore, Boston, Mass. Mr. Kimball is a former director of the Arizona and Colorado State Game and Fish Departments and is a graduate of Brigham Young University.)

President Beatrice, Miss Carson, gentlemen, please accept my thanks for the kind invitation to meet with you this evening. Such opportunities to enjoy Down East hospitality, New England seafood, and conversations with people whose opinions shape the thinking of millions of citizens are all too rare.

If you'll excuse me, I'd like to start things off by making a couple of personal observations. First, we all lost a good friend and respected leader when this State's division of fisheries and game director, Charley McLaughlin, passed away a few days ago. His untimely death dealt conservation in Massachusetts a blow from which it will take some time to recover. Charley's loss and the recent retirement of Roland Cobb, the respected commissioner of the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Game, have created a temporary leadership vacuum heretofore.

You and I know there must be well-qualified men available to fill these responsible positions, and you molders of public opinion must see to it that good men are chosen.

As Interior Secretary Udall is fond of saying, this is the decade of the quiet crisis in conservation. Our State administrators—caught as they are between a too-apathetic public, which wants State services without providing State employees with adequate compensation, and a Federal bureaucracy that is ready to step in when the State falters—must be men of iron who will come forward with dynamic, forward-looking programs and see them through. I wish you luck. Replacing Charley and Roland will be most difficult.

Second, the National Wildlife Federation is deeply indebted to all of you for your assistance this past fall in getting the word out to New England outdoor enthusiasts that we were about to publish a new magazine and enlist individual associate members. Our initial membership campaign has been a grand success, and the credit for this goes in large measure to you.

At the risk of overlooking others who have helped us as much, I am going to make a special point of thanking Brother Henry Moore, of the Boston Herald, for his efforts along these lines which, we know, brought us hundreds of inquiries.

The charter issue of National Wildlife magazine was mailed to some 68,221 associate members, and the second issue, now just coming off the press, probably will go to over 70,000 conservation-conscious Americans. Thanks for your help.

Now to get down to business, New England is in the hot glare of the national conservation spotlight. Recent surveys of outdoor recreation needs have dramatized the fact that, while Uncle Sam has hundreds of millions of acres in public ownership, most of these acres are a long, long way from the county's centers of population. What's needed, say the planners, are public recreation areas near the people—within 50 miles of their homes. Their findings seem to indicate that the acquisition of a thousand acres of public beach or forest smack in the